



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is not the province of this journal to outline the contents of great books nor to abridge the strength of a great picture into the feeble lines of a miniature; if it were, neither would be possible in this case, for the self-restraint of the author makes it impossible to prune or omit anything written by him. The book is one to be read and pondered exactly as it stands. The over-haste of those who skim and skip cannot put the reviewer under contribution for their knowledge or opinions, even if he were willing so to be taxed.

It appears to us that in the case of this book the reviewer can have but one of those functions ordinarily attributed to him. The student of history must constantly recall the author's point of view; Captain Mahan's is that of a naval expert. We gravely doubt whether he sufficiently recalls the duty imposed by his own skill as a writer. This book will be read by thousands of general readers who will justly consider it final. For such a public we believe he should have explained the moral as well as the legal aspects of certain events: for example in dealing with the battle of Copenhagen, we should have felt more content, could he have been more emphatic in his dealing with Nelson's notorious *ruse de guerre*. We doubt again whether the average student can understand the exact truth when he reads that "Prussia *promptly* adhered to the Armed Neutrality;" she was prompt to be sure, but most reluctant. Nor do we care to find the dubious pages of Bourrienne quoted as authority for Napoleon's conduct. These and some other similar cases of a too concise accuracy in the use of words are not of great importance in themselves nor numerous enough to constitute a blemish, but the reader should remember that Captain Mahan is a man of war who, although a fascinating writer and general historian, is chiefly concerned with history as a department of his profession and does not primarily regard it as a discipline of ethics.

Sir Robert Peel, from his Private Papers. Edited for his Trustees by CHARLES STUART PARKER, sometime M.P. for the County and for the City of Perth, and late Fellow of University College, Oxford. With a Chapter on his Life and Character by his Grandson, the Hon. GEORGE PEEL. Vols. II and III. (London: John Murray, 1889. Pp. [25], 602, [8], 663.)

PEEL held office for twenty years. He served under George III., George IV., William IV. and Queen Victoria, and was three times prime minister. His active political career began in 1810, when he became Under-Secretary for the Colonies in the Tory administration of Perceval, and it was continued until his death in 1850, when although out of office and no longer leader of the Conservative party, he was still a member of the House of Commons. Mr. Parker, the editor of the Peel Papers, early in the second volume records a conversation which he had with Gladstone in respect to Peel. Gladstone, who began his official career under Peel, then affirmed that, as there were two Pitts, one before and the other after the French Revolution, so there were two Peels, one before

and the other after the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. These new volumes begin in 1828, on the eve of the break-up of the old Tory party over Catholic Emancipation, and four years before the first Reform Act was passed. But it is with the Peel of the period after 1832—of the twenty years during which modern England was so largely in making—that they are chiefly concerned; and the letters and memoranda now published strongly emphasize Gladstone's description of Peel, and likewise confirm Guizot's estimate of the Peel of the period after Reform, when he described him as the most liberal of Conservatives, the most conservative of Liberals, and the most capable of both political parties during this epoch of English history.

Taking the three Peel volumes as a whole, it is difficult, if not impossible, to name any other collection of nineteenth-century letters and papers now published, which can be of greater value to students of modern English political history. They have this great value, not only by reason of the epoch-making periods which they cover, but also because the vast amount of material embodied in them is all first-hand. The work of the editor has been practically confined to selection and arrangement, and this work has been exceedingly well done. Mr. Parker's introductions to chapters, based mostly on Peel's *Memoirs*, on the Hansards, and on other equally authoritative material, are usually very brief. So, invariably, are the paragraphs knitting the letters together. There is so little of the editor that the volumes may be described as consisting entirely of the correspondence of Peel and his political colleagues. The two later volumes, which now complete the work, begin in 1828, and cover the period intervening between 1828 and 1850. They thus deal with the closing years of the old Tory party, and with the last years of the parliamentary system which came to an end in 1832, as well as with the great constitutional and economic changes which were made during the next twenty years, and with the readjustments of party lines which went on during the later half of Peel's life, and in which he had so eminent a share.

The three volumes bridge over the old and the new political England. They begin in the first decade after the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, and cover all the movements and changes in English politics, home, colonial and foreign, constitutional and economic, from the Union until the abandonment of protection in 1846.

In the first two volumes there are many letters which show how difficult was the administration of Ireland after the Union had taken place. The Irish Parliament was gone. The Union had removed this great difficulty in governing Ireland, and this great cause of apprehension in England. But the Castle system was continued on much the same lines as before the Union. Protestant ascendancy was undisturbed until 1829. Even then the real disturbance of the old system, so far as the executive details of Irish administration were concerned, was but small. Peel, notwithstanding his former and decided opposition to Emancipation, was loyal to the act which political exigencies compelled him to carry; and

his letters, for several years after Emancipation, contain the amplest evidence of his active and persistent dislike of the Castle traditions, and of his anxiety that the political and civil equality between the two forms of religion in Ireland, established by the act of 1829, should be real and of advantage to the Roman Catholics, who for a century and a quarter had labored under the disadvantage of exclusion.

With respect to movements more exclusively English, the letters bring out the inner details of the unsuccessful Tory opposition to Parliamentary Reform, and the extreme apprehensions with which the Tories at this time associated with Peel regarded the measure which Lord John Russell and Earl Grey carried through Parliament. Arbutnott, who had been a Tory government whip, and who was for so long the close and intimate friend of Wellington, and for years a channel of communication between Peel and Wellington, characterized the Reform Act as "nothing but wickedness and atrocity." This expresses the feeling of the Tories in 1832; and as the letters to Peel for several years subsequent to 1832 bring out, the Tories persisted in the conviction that the constitutional changes made in 1832 must inevitably endanger property and the stability of the Crown. Convictions like these were, of course, expressed in Parliament, when the bills of 1831 and 1832 were being forced through the two Houses by Russell and Grey. How long and how apparently sincerely these convictions were afterwards held by the ultra-Tories is exemplified by many letters to Peel; and letters, too, which were written privately and with no view to popular political effect. As late as 1836, even Sir James Graham, who had been of the Whig party and who joined it again after the repeal of the Corn Laws, wrote to Peel in the interest of a movement to be organized to resist "the tendency to a Republic."

After Parliamentary Reform came the reform of the old municipal corporations; and again, the letters to Peel give the inner history of the Tory opposition to the measure which has been the foundation of modern municipal government in England, and which in the political history of England in the nineteenth century must rank in importance next to the far-reaching change in the representative system in 1832. One after another the great changes which took place between 1832 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 are elucidated in Peel's letters and in those which were written to him by his correspondents. The origin of the modern income tax in England; the establishment of the existing currency system; the various measures of relief for Ireland; and finally the abandonment of protection are all dealt with in the letters to and from Peel. Peel, more than any of his Tory colleagues, loyally accepted the change made in 1832, and from the time he became prime minister for a brief period in 1835, owing to the eagerness of William IV. to rid himself of his Whig ministers, it is easy to trace in his letters the development of the Peel whom Guizot described as the "most liberal of Conservatives and the most conservative of Liberals."

Peel's liberalism is shown in his gradual but steady movement to-

wards the principles of free trade ; in his attitude towards Roman Catholics and towards English dissenters ; in his persistent efforts for an honest and efficient civil service ; and in his sincere and enlightened interest in the working classes, and his realization that it was possible to improve their economic and social condition, and also to better the position in which they then stood before the law with respect to their employers. There was much more liberalism of this kind in Peel than there was in the contemporary leaders of the Liberal party, such as Melbourne and Palmerston ; and in respect to free trade Peel was much in advance of the politicians who, between the Reform Act and the abandonment of protection, dominated the Whig party in Parliament.

Besides the light these letters to and from Peel throw on the domestic legislation in England in the first twenty years after the Reform Act, and on the new alignment of political parties, they are most informing with respect to the closing years of the old company rule in India, and to British relations with Canada and the United States. Many of the later letters have reference to the Oregon boundary dispute, and to the political troubles in French Canada in the early forties. The Oregon question was pending at the time of the disturbances in French Canada ; and in writing to Lord Aberdeen, who was Secretary for the Colonies in Peel's 1841-1846 administration, Peel gave expression to an opinion which, had it been uttered at the present time, would have ranked him among the "Little Englanders." He was disposed to keep Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for their geographical position made their sea-coast of great advantage to England. But if the people of lower Canada were not cordially with England, "why," Peel asked of Aberdeen, "should we contract the tremendous obligation of having to defend, on a point of honour, their territory against American aggression?" "Let us," he continued, "fight to the last for the point of honour, if the people are with us. In that case we cannot abandon them. But if they are not with us, or if they will not cordially support and sustain those measures which we consider necessary for their good government, and for the maintenance of a safe connection with them, let us have a friendly separation while there is yet time."

When Parliamentary Reform was carried in 1832, an end was made to the system developed to such perfection by George III., under which the Crown exercised an undue and entirely unconstitutional influence upon Parliament. The old relationship between the Crown and Parliament is well brought out in George III.'s letters to North ; for these eighteenth-century letters show the King acting as a manager of parliamentary elections, in other words as a "boss," working adroitly and zealously to elect members to the House of Commons whom he could afterwards use. In these Peel volumes, there are many letters from the Queen. More of the Queen's letters to a prime minister are contained in these two volumes than in any volume hitherto published. These letters show the whole-hearted sympathy of the Queen with Peel's free-trade policy. They are also of great value as showing the altered position of

the Crown towards Parliament and the Cabinet after Reform, when for the first time for centuries England had a sovereign who was content to occupy a really constitutional position towards Parliament, and to abstain from all interference in the election of its members.

Further than this, the Peel volumes throw much additional and oftentimes new light on Wellington, Canning, Liverpool, Grey, Russell, Melbourne, Palmerston, Graham, Gladstone, Disraeli, Bentinck, Cobden, Bright and O'Connell; in fact on nearly every statesman or politician who was prominent in Parliament between the Union and the end of Peel's last administration. The chapter on the life and character of Peel by his grandson, the Hon. George Peel, with which the third volume is brought to a close, is so helpful to readers, especially to those not familiar with all the ins and outs of English politics during Peel's long career, that it would have been well had it been given an earlier place in the volumes.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Cavour. By the Countess EVELYN MARTINENGO CESARESCO. [Foreign Statesmen Series.] (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. 222.)

THIS book has several claims to consideration. In the first place, it is the first biography written in English of the European statesman who, with Bismarck, dominates the last half of the nineteenth century. The hasty memoir which Mr. Dicey compiled and published a few weeks after Cavour's death, cannot be seriously considered in any discussion of Cavour biographies, and De La Rive's invaluable recollections lost their fine edge in being translated into English; so that to Countess 'Cesaresco belongs the credit of a pioneer. She is also the first to present, in any language, an epitome of the voluminous material which has accumulated during the past twenty years. But this would not suffice of itself to stamp her book with the distinction which characterizes it. She has achieved the double feat of making the personages she has to deal with live, and of keeping a proper balance between biography and history. It is as rare to find an historian who can breathe life into his characters as it is to find a novelist. In this very series, for example, Mr. Frederic Harrison, writing on William the Silent, and Mr. Richard Lodge, writing on Richelieu, do not always make us feel that William and Richelieu were once alive. Countess Cesaresco, on the other hand, never suggests that Cavour was merely a lay-figure on which she clothes certain historical abstractions. So, too, although in her summary Cavour's work predominates, as it should, the share which other actors took in the unification of Italy is clearly and accurately stated, and the general principles involved are well defined. Her book might be used as a syllabus by any one wishing to master this most fascinating period; but it differs from other syllabi in being full of sparkle and interest.

Among the points which the author has dealt with especially well is